

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/663,038	09/15/2000	Edward Christian Jelks	41992-00220	. 3377
7590 07/12/2004 MARSH FISCHMANN & BREYFOGLE LLP			EXAMINER	
			PAYNE, DAVID C	
3151 South Vaghn Way Suite 411 Aurora, CO 80014		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2633	
			DATE MAILED: 07/12/2004	, /

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	09/663,038	JELKS, EDWARD CHRISTIAN			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	David C. Payne	2633			
The MAILING DATE of this communicati Period for Reply	ion appears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATORY STATE OF THIS COMMUNICATORY STATE OF THIS COMMUNICATORY (a) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicATORY (b) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicATORY (c) of the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) day of the Month of the	TION. CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a restion. ys, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON by statute, cause the application to become AB	eply be timely filed y (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed or	n <u>22 <i>April</i> 2004</u> .				
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b)	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.				
closed in accordance with the practice u	ınder <i>Ex parte Quayl</i> e, 1935 C.D	. 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) <u>1-26</u> is/are pending in the appli 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are w 5) ☐ Claim(s) <u>23</u> is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) <u>1, 3-8, 11-14, 16-21, and 24-26</u> 7) ☐ Claim(s) <u>2,9,10,15 and 22</u> is/are objecte 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction	oithdrawn from consideration. Solution is selected. Solution is selected. Solution is selected.				
Application Papers					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Ex 10)☑ The drawing(s) filed on 22 April 2004 is/a Applicant may not request that any objection Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the 11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by	are: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ object to the drawing(s) be held in abeyan correction is required if the drawing(ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for f a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority doc 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority doc 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International * See the attached detailed Office action for	numents have been received. Euments have been received in A ne priority documents have been Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage			
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview S	ummary (PTO-413)			
Notice of References Cited (P10-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-83) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s	s)/Mail Date formal Patent Application (PTO-152)			

Ar't Unit: 2633

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-26 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- Claims 1, 3-8, 11-14, 16-21, and 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.
 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki et al. US 5,754,714 (Suzuki) in view of Hofmeister US 6,091,864 (Hofmeister) and Heflinger et al. US 6,396,605 B1 (Heflinger).

Regarding claims 1, 8, 14, 18, 26 Suzuki disclosed

A high efficiency optical feedback modulator operable to produce a high modulation depth optical signal, comprising:

an optical modulator (figure 7) having a first (signal light) and a second optical input (control light) and a first and a second optical output (13 or 14); wherein the first optical input is operable to receive an input light beam.

Suzuki does not disclose an optical feedback system coupling the second

Art Unit: 2633

optical output to the second optical input and operable to communicate an optical feedback signal from the second optical output to the second optical input (control light);

Suzuki does not disclose that the optical modulator operates to modulate the input light beam and the optical feedback signal in response to an electrical signal to optical signal from the first optical output.

Hofmeister disclosed (Figure 4) an optical modulator with an electrical input (RF1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modulate the Suzuki modulator with the external (RF1) signal in order to imprint an analog data signal such as a CATV signal (see col./line(s): 4/15-25). Furthermore, no patentable weight has been given to the limitation of "the high modulation depth" since it does not pose any substantive differences over the prior art.

Heflinger disclosed a modulator (Figure 1) with feedback (16 of Figure 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use the Heflinger feedback in the Suzuki invention so as to tune the optical interferometer without introducing dither to the optical path length of the leg of the optical interferometer (see Heflinger col. 2 lines 45-60).

Regarding claim 3, Suzuki disclosed an optical waveguide (Figure 7).

Regarding claims 4, 17, 19 the modified invention of Suzuki, Hofmeister and Heflinger disclosed an analog signal (CATV, see col./line(s): 4/15-25).

Art Unit: 2633

Regarding claim 16, Suzuki disclosed a Mach Zehnder two-by-two optical modulator (Figure 7).

Regarding claims 5, 11, and 25 Suzuki disclosed couplers (Figure 7, #1 and #2) but not 3db couplers. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use 3db couplers so the an equal amount of energy would be split be each branch yielding a 50:50 power split and equally mixing the input optical signals as is well known in the art.

Regarding claims 6, 12 the modified invention of Suzuki, Hofmeister and Heflinger disclosed a first and second phase modulator (Hofmeister, figure 5, #102, and #116).

Regarding claims 7, 13, 20 the modified invention of Suzuki, Hofmeister and Heflinger disclosed the use of repeaters (Hofmeister, e.g., col./line: 4/20-27).

Regarding claim 21, Suzuki disclosed, (figure 7)

a method of communicating an input light beam to a first optical input (signal light) of an optical modulator;

Suzuki does not disclose intensity modulating at least one of the optical signals with an electronic input signal to produce a first and a second phase shift optical signal; and coupling the phase shift optical signals to produce an

Art Unit: 2633

optical feedback signal.

Suzuki does not disclose that the optical modulator operates to modulate the input light beam and the optical feedback signal in response to an electrical signal to optical signal from the first optical output.

Hofmeister disclosed (Figure 5) an optical modulator with an electrical input (RF1) controllable to shift the phase of the signals. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modulate the Suzuki modulator with the external (RF1) signal in order to imprint an analog data signal such as a CATV signal (see col./line(s): 4/15-25). Heflinger disclosed a modulator (Figure 1) with feedback (16 of Figure 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use the Heflinger feedback in the Suzuki invention so as to tune the optical interferometer without introducing dither to the optical path length of the leg of the optical interferometer (see Heflinger col. 2 lines 45-60).

Regarding claims 2, 10, 15, and 22 the modified invention of Suzuki and Hofmeister does not disclose an amplifier in the feedback path. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to place an amplifier in the feedback path in order to amplify the output of the modulator as is well known in the art to do.

Regarding claim 24 Suzuki disclosed

A high efficiency optical feedback modulator operable to produce a high

Art Unit: 2633

modulation depth optical signal, comprising:

an Mach Zehnder two-by-two optical modulator (figure 7) having a two optical inputs (signal light, control light) and at least two optical outputs (13 or 14);

Suzuki does not disclose that the optical modulator operates to modulate the input light beam and the optical feedback signal in response to an electrical signal to optical signal from the first optical output, and an optical receiver. Hofmeister disclosed (Figure 4) an optical modulator with an electrical input (RF1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modulate the Suzuki modulator with the external (RF1) signal in order to imprint an analog data signal such as a CATV signal (see col./line(s): 4/15-25). Furthermore, no patentable weight has been given to the limitation of "the high modulation depth" since it does not pose any substantive differences over the prior art.

Heflinger disclosed a modulator (Figure 1) with feedback (16 of Figure 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use the Heflinger feedback in the Suzuki invention so as to tune the optical interferometer without introducing dither to the optical path length of the leg of the optical interferometer (see Heflinger col. 2 lines 45-60).

Allowable Subject Matter

Art Unit: 2633

4. Claims 2, 9, 10, 15 and 22 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

5. Claim 23 is allowed.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David C. Payne whose telephone number is (703) 306-0004. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 7a-4p.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Chan can be reached on (703) 305-4729. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9314.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

DePayor, Patent Examiner A42633

Dcp

Art Unit: 2633